

THIRTY FIVE CENTS

MARCH 1951

MONTHLY REVIEW

AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

LEFT SOCIALISM IN ISRAEL

AN ISRAELI SOCIALIST

**EISENHOWER, GERMAN REARMAMENT,
AND WORLD PEACE**

THE EDITORS

THE CURRENT ECONOMIC SITUATION

UE WASHINGTON NOTES

VOL. 2

11

EDITORS . . . LEO HUBERMAN . . . PAUL M. SWEETZ

CONTENTS

VOLUME TWO NUMBER ELEVEN MARCH, 1951

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: Eisenhower, German Rearmement, And World Peace	479
LEFT SOCIALISM IN ISRAEL (Part 2) by An Israeli Socialist	487
THE CURRENT ECONOMIC SITUATION from UE Washington Notes	497
WHAT MAKES REVOLUTIONS by James Aldridge	502
"FREE WORLD" DEPARTMENT by The Editors	504
FOR THE RECORD by The Editors	508

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly and copyright, 1951, in the United States, by MONTHLY REVIEW—AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE, 66 Barrow St., New York 14, New York.
SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One year—\$3.00 (foreign, \$3.50); two years—\$5.00 (foreign \$6.00).
Single copy 35c; 15 or more 25c. (Vol. 1 No. 1 \$1.00; Vol. 2 No. 6 \$1.00)

EDITORS AND PUBLISHERS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

We recently received through the mail an anonymous article dealing with the Marxian and Freudian theories of human nature. In fact, so anonymous was the article that it was not even accompanied by the name and address of the author. We are therefore unable to thank the author and to explain to him that the article is somewhat too specialized and technical for MR, and that in any case we do not publish anonymous articles unless we know the identity of the author. This incident moves us to explain once again our policy on anonymity. We quote from "Notes from the Editors" in the September, 1949, issue:

There are few people in the United States today who can openly express socialist views without suffering very real penalties. These penalties are inflicted by governments, by private employers, by all kinds of associations such as churches and clubs, and finally by what is called "public opinion." They range from a degree of social ostracism in the case of those whose income is relatively secure to loss of employment, destitution, and possibly starvation in the case of those who lack any guarantees of economic security. That is why we are publishing and will continue to publish anonymous articles. Authors know their own position and problems better than we do. If they ask to remain anonymous, we know they have good reason for doing so, and we shall respect their wishes.

(continued on page 510)

EISENHOWER, GERMAN REARMAMENT, AND WORLD PEACE

General Eisenhower's speech of February 1 to Congress unquestionably marks a change in the attitude of the United States government toward German rearmament. A few weeks ago we were being told that German rearmament was a matter of utmost urgency, a life-and-death question for western Europe threatened with immediate Russian invasion. Now the general says that it isn't even time "to start to talk about including units of Germans in any kind of army."

Let us first pause to note the utter cynicism to which this abrupt about-face testifies. For months a Big Lie was sedulously propagated by all the means available to the government, and then suddenly Eisenhower is trotted out to say that there was nothing to it after all. He only neglects to tell us that it was all good, clean fun. . . .

What is the nature of the change in the American attitude toward German rearmament? And what does it signify?

Here is the full text of what Eisenhower said about Germany:

I am not even going to mention my several conversations in Germany, and for a very specific reason. I personally think that there has to be a political platform achieved, an understanding that will contemplate an eventual and an earned equality on the part of that nation before we should start to talk about including units of Germans in any kind of army. Certainly I, for one commander, want no unwilling contingents, no soldiers serving in the pattern of the Hessians serving in our Revolutionary War, in any army of my command. It would only be a source of weakness. Therefore until the political leaders, the diplomats and the statesmen find proper answer to that one, it is not for a soldier to delve in too deeply.

The only thing that is clear about this is that Eisenhower does not think that now is the time to consider German rearmament. He does not renounce German rearmament; on the other hand, his statement does not prove that he supports German rearmament.

There is, however, other evidence on this question, and it unmistakably points to the conclusion that American policy is still committed to German rearmament and that Eisenhower is in full agree-

MONTHLY REVIEW

ment with this policy. Most important in this connection are the statements made in Frankfurt on January 29th by Sir Ivone Kirkpatrick, British High Commissioner in Germany. Kirkpatrick is an old "German hand" in the British foreign service, conducted the interrogations of Rudolf Hess after the latter flew to Britain during the war, and subsequently served as one of Eisenhower's political advisers at SHAEF. According to Drew Middleton's dispatch in the *New York Times* of January 30th, Kirkpatrick "said he had discussed this matter [policy toward Germany] with the supreme commander of the North Atlantic Pact forces when the latter was in Germany, and that the position he had outlined substantially was that favored by the commander." Let us look at this position.

According to Middleton, Kirkpatrick said that German rearmament is "a secondary issue that can be *delayed* until a 'partnership' has been established between the western powers and the [West German] Federal Republic, and the North Atlantic Treaty powers themselves are a source of strength." (Italics added.) In other words, military strength must first be built up in the United States, Britain, and France, and the West Germans must be politically fully coordinated with the North Atlantic Pact powers before German rearmament can be profitably undertaken. But these steps are to pave the way for German rearmament: "Sir Ivone emphasized that the rest of Europe must be strong *if German rearmament was to come easily and quickly.*" (Italics added.) Summing up, Middleton put the matter this way:

This represents an important change in the timing of German rearmament and in the emphasis on what is to be done in the Federal Republic, but it does not mean that the basic American or British policy on rearmament has been altered.

This is all clear enough, and unless or until there is a specific statement by Eisenhower or Truman or Acheson repudiating the goal of German rearmament, we must assume that it remains the keystone of this country's European policy. The change signaled by General Eisenhower's speech to Congress is purely one of timing and tactics; it does not touch the substance of American policy.

This is an important point to establish. There are too many people who want to let themselves be persuaded that the United States has abandoned the insane policy of plunging into World War III through rearming its enemies of World War II. It has not abandoned that policy. What's more it could not abandon that policy without drastically revising its basic objectives in the whole sphere of international relations.

In order to appreciate this fully, we must go back, as we did in

REVIEW OF THE MONTH

last month's "Review of the Month," to Mr. Acheson's famous seven points made in his Berkeley speech of last March 16th. These seven points provide the guiding lines of American policy. Unless we understand them, we cannot understand anything about American policy, and least of all its orientation toward the rearming of Germany.

First point: The German, Austrian, and Japanese peace treaties must make those countries "free"—in other words anti-Soviet allies of the United States.

Second point: "Orderly representative processes" must be introduced into "the whole group of countries we are accustomed to think of as the satellite area"—in other words, the Soviet Union must stand aside while the United States organizes and finances a counter-revolution in eastern Europe.

Third point: "The Soviet leaders could drop their policy of obstruction in the United Nations"—in other words, the Soviet Union must accept American domination of the UN.

Fourth point: The Soviet Union must accept "realistic and effective arrangements for the control of atomic weapons and the limitations of armaments in general"—in other words, the Soviet Union must place all of her work in the field of atomic energy under the inspection and control of an American-dominated agency.

Fifth point: The Soviet union must "desist from, and cooperate in efforts to prevent, indirect aggression across national frontiers"—in other words, ("indirect Russian aggression" being the usual pseudonym for national revolution) the Soviet Union must assist the United States in suppressing revolutions wherever they may threaten.

Sixth point: The Soviet Union and its allies (as long as it still has any) must give American official representatives the run of their countries.

Seventh point: The Soviet leaders must stop criticizing the United States and its allies.

In sum, then, the objectives of American policy are to make the Soviet Union back down al' along the line and to admit that the United States has a right to run the world.

Now two things are perfectly clear: the Soviet Union is not going to accept these terms; and in the last few years, especially as the result of the Chinese Revolution, the world balance of forces has been shifting strongly in her favor and against the United States. It follows that the United States must either change its basic objectives, or reverse the trend of the last few years and somehow build up sufficient strength literally to force the Soviet Union to submit. No one in authority or anywhere near it seems in the least inclined to change America's basic objectives. Hence there is no alternative but

to turn the country into a military camp and to collect and arm as many allies as possible. West Germany and Japan are the most promising candidates for the role of powerful military allies. Given the larger pattern of American policy, the only possible dispute is over how best to bring them into the fold and insure that they do what is wanted of them.

The Eisenhower speech simply signifies that the administration now recognizes that it was trying to go too fast in the matter of German rearmament and that it has decided, in the light of German reluctance and Franco-British pressure (in turn generated by internal popular revulsion against German rearmament), to revise the timetable.

This revision of the timetable is a good thing, not for its own sake but because it shows that popular pressure (alas, most of it as yet outside this country) can oblige the United States government to alter its course, and because it provides a breathing spell in which the peace forces can generate much greater pressure for a change in the direction of American policy. *If German rearmament can be made inexpedient this year, it can be made impossible next year or the year after.*

How can this be done? By showing to the peoples of Europe (and eventually, we may hope, also of the United States) that there is a real alternative to the world war which American policy, if continued long enough, will certainly bring on; and that the first step in the realization of this alternative must be the transformation of Germany into a unified, demilitarized, and neutral buffer state between the American bloc in the West and the Soviet bloc in the East. If the European peoples can be convinced of this, they will simply refuse to follow the United States into the slaughterhouse of World War III. The *sine qua non* of American policy—strong and reliable military allies—will vanish into thin air, even as a hope for the future; and the American people may at last wake up to the disastrous course along which they have been so long and so recklessly led.

It is thus not only German rearmament that stands in the middle of the struggle for peace; it is also German unity and German neutrality. These are the issues which dominate the whole European political scene. Both sides are aware of the high stakes involved: if the masses can be won to a belief in the possibility (they do not have to be convinced of the desirability) of German demilitarization, unification, and neutralization, then America's war-breeding policy of forcing the Soviet bloc to submit to its demands will have suffered a severe, and perhaps even a fatal, blow.

Let us examine the way the two sides are reacting to this situation. On the one side we have the Soviet Union and the East Ger-

man government; on the other the United States and the West German government.

The Soviet Union's course has on the whole been sensible and direct. Soon after the announcement last September of the western powers' intention to rearm West Germany, the Soviet Union solemnly warned that it could not tolerate this course, thus putting the whole world on notice that German rearmament would lead to war. It then summoned a conference at Prague of the eastern European countries (including East Germany) to discuss the German problem. This conference issued a statement denouncing the policy of remilitarizing West Germany and proposing instead that the Big Four restate their determination to prohibit the remilitarization of Germany, remove restrictions on the development of the German peace economy, and conclude a peace treaty providing for the unification of Germany and an end to the occupation. The peace treaty should be drawn up with the advice of an All-German Constituent Council consisting of an equal number of representatives from East and West Germany. The Council would also have the task of preparing an All-German government. Immediately following the Prague conference, the Soviet Union addressed notes to the western powers requesting a meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers to deal with the German problem. Soon afterward, the East German government proposed to the West German government that the two enter negotiations with a view to the formation of a Constituent Council along the lines suggested in the Prague communiqué.

From the outset, the United States and the West German government have done their best to discourage and repulse every overture from the East. (France and Britain have obviously been anxious to hold a Big-Four meeting, but they have not dared to take any steps independently of Washington.) On the international level, this has taken the form of stalling off the Soviet demand for a meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers, and we are only now, some four months later, about to see the foreign ministers' deputies sit down and discuss an agenda for such a meeting. On the German level, the West German government has been busy trying to discredit the East German proposals for unity negotiations.

An extremely important result of this process of jockeying and maneuvering for position has been an ever-clearer definition of the terms on which the East believes the German problem can and should be settled. These were stated in a very general way in the Prague declaration, but they have been progressively clarified as the East has met one after another of the western objections to unity negotiations. According to a dispatch from the Hague in the *New York Times* of

MONTHLY REVIEW

January 28th, the East German government is now offering the following terms:

1. Disbanding of the East German People's Police and abandonment of plans to rearm West Germany.
2. Withdrawal of all foreign troops in Germany.
3. Unification of Germany through an election to be held under international auspices.
4. Establishment of a neutral German state.

Of course, there is no official confirmation that these terms are acceptable to the Soviet Union; they may not be. But it is significant that the West believes that they are. Drew Middleton reported from Frankfurt in the *Times* of February 4th:

It is not suggested that the Russians will immediately offer free elections throughout Germany as the basis of unity or withdrawal of all occupation forces, including their own.

But it is probable that, given a considerable period of negotiations, they will come around to these terms.

And a week later, Middleton, reporting a speech of West German Chancellor Adenauer, made the following statement:

He [Adenauer] also said that the Soviet proposals in a conference of the foreign ministers were clear. These, he said, would include the unification of Germany, demilitarization, and a German neutrality between East and West.

Demilitarization, he said, probably would include the dissolution of the People's Police military units in eastern Germany. (*Times*, Feb. 11.)

It is hardly a cause for surprise that Adenauer is opposed to a settlement on these terms. He has a political racket in West Germany which would certainly be knocked into a cocked hat by the peaceful unification of the country. The Catholic population, on which he relies for political support, is heavily concentrated in the West. If all political parties were legalized throughout a unified Germany, the results would probably be an increase in strength for the Social Democrats, the emergence of a strong Communist Party on the national level, and a sharp decline for the Christian Democrats. Adenauer would suffer the sad fate of Humpty Dumpty.

But you would think that every one else should be delighted by the prospect of a settlement on these terms. For the masses of Europe, they carry the hope of a genuine relaxation of tensions. And they meet all the conditions that the United States has all along been proclaiming must be met by a German settlement. There would be no possible ground for suspicion of a "Communist conspiracy"

to take over Germany; on the contrary, a settlement along the lines indicated would most likely lead to a nationwide political victory for the Social Democrats—something which both Moscow and Washington must know perfectly well.

And yet it is an undoubted fact that the United States government is not at all enthusiastic about a German settlement of this kind. Under existing circumstances, indeed, as Drew Middleton reports from Frankfurt, "the idea of a four-power conference of the West with the Soviet Union fills many important American personages in Germany and in Washington with alarm and despondency." (*Times*, Feb. 4.)

Why?

People who assume that American policy is directed to the defense of western Europe against possible aggression find this an insoluble puzzle. From the point of view of this goal, what could be more desirable than the elimination of a potential Korea in the middle of Europe? What could be more desirable than the withdrawal of the Red Army behind the Oder (and very likely all the way to the borders of the Soviet Union, since there would no longer be any reason for keeping troops in Poland)? What could be more desirable than the establishment in all of Germany of a regime ideologically sympathetic to the western powers? Obviously, if the aim of American policy were really the defense of Europe against real or imagined threats, the United States should jump at the chance that the Soviet Union might accept such terms, and should be delighted to learn that the chance seems to be a good one.

The fact that the American attitude is just the reverse proves once again that the defense of western Europe is *not* the aim of American policy. Once we consider the matter in the light of our earlier analysis of American policy, however, we can see at once why the United States government is desperately alarmed at the prospect of a settlement on the terms indicated. For a unified, demilitarized, unoccupied, and neutralized Germany would not be available as a military ally, and it is anti-Soviet military allies, above all else, that American policy requires.

Whether or not there is a real possibility of averting a third world war may be decided in the next few months. A four-power conference will almost certainly be held. The United States does not want one, but an American veto would split the western powers wide apart and for this reason would be politically disastrous. Instead of vetoing the conference, therefore, Messrs. Truman and Acheson will doubtless do everything in their power to assure its failure. This they can probably achieve, at least in a formal sense. But formal failure need not be decisive. If the conference shows that the

MONTHLY REVIEW

German problem can be settled in such a way as to ban rearmament and to make of Germany a neutral buffer between the eastern and western blocs, and if it proves that responsibility for sabotaging a settlement along these lines rests solely on the United States, then the eyes of the peoples of Europe may be opened as never before to the real nature of America's aims.

Should this happen, the United States (or more accurately the American ruling class) would be on the way to losing its already-wavering allies, and the world might conceivably be on the way to peace.

(February 16, 1951)

I believe most British people agree with me in being utterly opposed to any proposal to rearm Western Germany. I am utterly opposed to this, both because I thoroughly mistrust the Germans and do not feel at all sure on whose side their arms would be used, and also because I feel certain that the effect of rearmament will be to bring the worst sort of militarist reactionaries back to power in Germany. But most of all I oppose West German rearmament because it will create in Germany a position closely analogous to that which has brought dire misfortune in Korea—two enemies of one nation facing each other across an utterly unreal frontier, and each supported by one of the major contestants in the Cold War. What could be worse than this as a means of averting the world war which we are all still professing our desire to prevent?

—G. D. H. Cole in *The New Statesman and Nation*, Feb. 3, 1951

Not the politician, not the bribe-taker, but the bribe-giver, the man we are so proud of, our successful businessman—he is the source and sustenance of bad government.

—Lincoln Steffens

LEFT SOCIALISM IN ISRAEL

BY AN ISRAELI SOCIALIST

PART II

The Evolution of MAPAM Since Its Beginning

In May, 1948, when a provisional coalition government was set up in Israel, MAPAM joined the government alongside the social-democratic MAPAI, the religious bloc, and the Jewish "traditional right" (the General Zionists). At that time the whole country was mobilized for the war of National Liberation; thus, MAPAM'S participation in the provisional coalition government was most useful and commendable. MAPAM held the portfolios of Agriculture (Mr. Zisling), and Labor and Public Works (Mr. Bentov).

In January, 1949, the elections to the Israel Constituent Assembly took place. The foreign war was at a standstill (and has been ever since), so that the election campaign of both MAPAI and MAPAM centred around two main problems: the country's domestic economic policy and its foreign policy.

1. *Economic policy.* Although called a socialist party, MAPAI does not believe in socialism as a means of realizing Zionism. On the contrary, according to it, the "socialist vision" must wait the prior fulfillment of the Zionist mission. Mr. E. Kaplan, Finance Minister and leading member of MAPAI, defined his policy as follows: "The socialization of industries must wait until these industries have been established in the country." In the opinion of MAPAI, only private enterprise can insure the swift industrial development of the country. (The policy, incidentally, has proved a complete failure, to which today's critical economic position bears testimony.) Lest it should frighten away would-be investors, MAPAI did not even take such progressive measures as did the Laborites in Britain; but in spite of this caution, the longed-for investors failed to materialize.

MAPAM demanded: first, a planned economy under popular

The first part of this article appeared in the January issue of MR. This is the concluding part. Its timeliness is greatly increased by the occurrence during February of a governmental crisis which resulted in the fall of the Ben Gurion coalition cabinet. At the time of going to press, it seems almost certain that new parliamentary elections will be held some time during the next few months.—Ed.

control wherein the Histadruth (Trade Union Federation) should have a prominent part—as against the unrestricted capitalism demanded by the opposition of the Right, or the paltry administrative controls desired by MAPAI; and second, the mobilization of all the forces of the nation to expand the development of the country, to increase production, and to handle effectively the absorption of mass immigration.

In a subsequent more detailed definition of MAPAM's economic program we find:

1. The principle of taxation according to ability to pay, hence higher property taxes and lower indirect taxes; reduction of the immense profits of industry and commerce; control of the rate of profit; concentration of vital imports in the hands of the state.
2. The nationalization of land in the development areas (where the new immigrants are being settled) and of the natural resources of the country.
3. A labor policy in opposition to the "wage freeze" program of MAPAI and for the correction of the official index to make it reflect the real cost of living.

To understand how MAPAI can successfully impose the policy of freezing wages, we must realize that it is the leading government party and that it also has control over the Histadruth, which is the country's trade union federation embracing 311,000 members (40 per cent of the adult population). This powerful and rich organization, which could have been a stronghold in the fight for the workers' interests, became the loyal valet of the government; and the workers gradually lost confidence in its leadership. The Histadruth, incidentally, is also the biggest employer in the country, and more and more frequently we see cases of workers deciding to strike despite the advice of the leadership of the Histadruth.

2. *Foreign policy.* Here MAPAM opposed the policy of "neutrality" professed by MAPAI and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, M. M. Sharett—a policy which in fact turned out to be more and more pro-Western. MAPAM asked for a real policy of independence vis-a-vis those foreign powers who want to install military bases in our country and to obtain large economic concessions, with the inevitable result of drawing us into the adventure of imperialist war. To illustrate concretely: everyone knows that King Abdullah of Jordan is a puppet of Great Britain, and that his army is paid for and commanded by Great Britain through the British colonel popularly known under the name of Glubb Pasha. The eastern part of Palestine which, according to the UN decisions, was to be developed

into an independent Arab State was conquered by Abdullah's Arab Legion. MAPAM vigorously opposed the proposal to treat with Abdullah, on the grounds that to do so would be to recognize British imperialism through the back door. But MAPAI treats with Abdullah, thus accepting the installation in Palestine of military bases for an eventual anti-Soviet war.

More recent political events showed the cleavage between the two parties. MAPAI requested and obtained the withdrawal of the Histadruth from the World Federation of Trade Unions. MAPAM strongly opposed this action and proposed a referendum among the members on the issue of affiliation to the WFTU. This proposal was rejected and MAPAI followed the path of the right-wing trade union organizations of Great Britain and the United States in betraying the international solidarity of the workers. The Histadruth, however, did not join the phony international recently formed in London.

MAPAM, with its 40,000 registered members, has been at the head of the fight for peace and in particular led the Stockholm appeal campaign. More than 320,000 signatures have been collected as of the time of writing. MAPAI, like its social democratic brothers, denounced the campaign as a "Communist maneuver" for peace. This did not prevent many MAPAI members—even prominent ones like Y. Klinov—from signing the appeal.

In view of the disagreements between MAPAM and MAPAI, one might ask why MAPAM did not form a common bloc with the Israeli Communist Party for the elections. Conversations between the two parties were undertaken, but without result. The chief bone of contention was the rejection by the Communist Party of the Zionist socialist thesis of MAPAM, according to which it is only in Israel, following a territorial concentration of the Jewish people, that the Jewish problem can be solved. The Communist Party rejects the contention that the Jewish problem is a peculiar one. According to it, the victory of socialism in the countries where Jews are living will more or less automatically resolve the Jewish question. For this position there are both theoretical and practical grounds.

The theoretical basis is the denial of the separate existence of a Jewish nation. Ilya Ehrenburg, the well-known Soviet author, wrote in an article published by Pravda on September 21, 1948: "There is very little in common between the Jews of Tunis and the Jews of Chicago. And if we find a relation between them, this is not at all a mystical one: anti-semitism created this relation." Since, according to Ehrenburg, anti-semitism flowers under capitalism but will disappear in a society free from exploitation, the practical conclusion is that progressive Jews must fight anti-semitism in every

country by fighting for the victory of socialism. The Jewish masses should thus fight their battles in their respective countries, rather than join the Zionist movement alongside the Jewish bourgeoisie. The contention that Jewish workers should join in a movement in which bourgeois reformists are in the majority is regarded as an incorrect position by the Israeli Communists. This problem became even more acute after World War II, when the question arose of the migration of the Jews from the peoples' democracies to Israel, a capitalist state.

We should like to add at this point that the discussion around Zionism did not prevent the socialist camp, the peoples' democracies with Soviet Russia at their head, from being the most sincere defenders of the newly-born State of Israel in its fight for independence. Never will the Jewish people forget the support of the Soviet delegation during the historic debates in the UN, or the active help it received from the peoples' democracies during the War of Independence. The Jewish people have the deepest respect and affection for Andrei Gromyko, Deputy Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, who declared in May, 1947: "The fact that not even one West European State was able to assure the defense of the most elementary rights of the Jewish people, or to make amends for the cruelty it suffered from the fascist hangmen, explains the aspiration of the Jews for the creation of their own state. It would be unjust not to take this into consideration and to oppose the right of the Jews to realize this aspiration."

The whole-hearted support of the Israeli state by the socialist camp does not, however, imply the recognition of the Zionist solution by the Israeli Communist Party, though it was the Zionist movement which was the chief factor in bringing into being this state.

It is partly the position of the Israeli Communist Party on the national question which accounts for the relative numerical weakness of the Communists in Israel.

The Elections of January 1949

The January 1949 elections had the following results: MAPAI 34.70 percent; MAPAM 14.54 percent; Religious Bloc 12.03 percent; Herout (extreme right-wing party, composed mainly of former Irgun members) 11.30 percent; General Zionists, 5.7 percent; Progressists (a fraction of the General Zionists) 4.6 percent; Communists 3.5 percent. Several other splinter parties got the insignificant remainder of the votes. The elections to the Histadruth, which took place shortly afterwards, gave 58 percent of the vote to MAPAI,

and 34 percent to MAPAM, the remainder going to the Communists and two smaller groups.*

MAPAM thus emerged as the second strongest party. Looking back, we may say that these elections marked the summit of MAPAM. Its ranks were still more or less united. Its members had fought together first the military, next the political campaign. During the summer of 1949, however, the first serious controversies within MAPAM began around the issue of participation in the government. MAPAM proposed to MAPAI a coalition government wherein the workers' parties would hold the dominant position, based on a minimum program upon which the parties could agree and which would defend the interests of the Israeli workers. No monopoly by the workers' parties was suggested; on the contrary, the participation of elements from the petty-bourgeois parties, particularly the Progressists, was encouraged. MAPAI, however, true to the best social democratic tradition, chose to join with the religious bloc and the Right. Having done this, it invited MAPAM to come into the government on MAPAI's own program. MAPAI obviously did not extend this invitation in the sincere hope that MAPAM would join the coalition cabinet. There were three real reasons for the invitation—all of them purely demagogic:

1. MAPAI wanted to appear before the working class as the true champions of workers' unity;
2. It wanted to make MAPAM share in the unpopular economic policy of the government, a policy which was causing the gradual diminution of workers' purchasing power as well as general economic disaster. (Despite the most severe rationing, exports account for no more than 15 percent of imports, resulting in a terrible gap in our trade balance.)
3. Being well aware of the discussions within MAPAM around the issue of participation in the government, MAPAI chose to intensify them by extending its invitation. The MAPAI

* Since this was written, municipal elections were held (November 14, 1950) in 43 villages and cities of Israel. These elections, while of course not strictly comparable to the outcome of the parliamentary election, showed the following results:

MAPAI dropped from 37.2 percent to 26.9 percent
 MAPAM increased from 10.6 percent to 11.4 percent
 Religious Bloc dropped from 15.4 percent to 12.8 percent
 Herout dropped from 15.4 percent to 10.5 percent
 General Zionists jumped from 7.3 percent to 25.2 percent
 Progressists dropped from 5.5 percent to 4.0 percent
 Communists dropped from 2.6 percent to 2.4 percent

The growth in the General Zionists' vote came primarily at the expense of MAPAI; it signifies an increased support of the reactionary element in the country.—Ed.

press at that time appealed to the "responsible elements," to the "good boys" of MAPAM, who were ready to share the responsibilities of power, as against the "demagogues who received their orders from Moscow," and whose only purpose was to embarrass the government.

MAPAI's calculation was right. The discussion between the two parties, together with the struggle which went on within MAPAM, lasted for many months. Such leaders as Tabenkin and Ben-Aharon, who both came from Achduth Haavoda, contended that MAPAM alone, without the cooperation of MAPAI, could not take power, and that on the other hand, MAPAM could not hope for a healthy development while in opposition. First of all, therefore, it must enter the Government. The former Left Poalei Zion leader, Zrubavel, held the same view.

The left wing, composed mainly of former Hashomer Hatzair members, and represented by leaders such as J. Riftin, M. Yaari, and J. Hasan, and the leaders of the party in the towns, such as Dr. M. Sneh, former Commander in Chief of the Haganah, opposed adhesion to the government prior to the acceptance by MAPAI of a minimum program which would safeguard the interests of the working class. Eventually, the party decided not to enter the government for the time being. The subsequent policy of the government, especially its attitude on the Korean question, killed all hopes of participation. MAPAI thus stayed in a coalition with the religious bloc and the moderates, being increasingly forced to accept the claims of orthodox Jewry and the Right, who became the real masters of the country, MAPAI serving as the mere executor of their policies. The cabinet crisis of September, 1950, when, with the approaching municipal elections, the coalition parties hardened their respective attitudes, ended with a new victory for the religious bloc. The official clerical paper *Hatzofeh* wrote on this occasion: "Besides the important practical gains made by the religious bloc—reorganization of the government and establishment of a committee to deal with religious problems and to satisfy our demands—one may consider the serious crisis and the subsequent accord as an important phase in the process of the gathering of strength and influence by organized orthodox Jewry."

The question of participation in the government showed for the first time the intensity of dissension within MAPAM. Since then a series of issues, some of them vital, has arisen in which these conflicts are more and more conspicuous. The last part of this article will deal briefly with two of the points at issue: the Arab question and the organizational structure of the party.

I. The Arab Question

According to official statistics, about 170,000 Arabs now live in Israel (about 16 percent of the population). Though their economic situation is for the most part better than in the surrounding Arab countries, it is as yet much worse than that of the Jewish citizens. The Arab minority sometimes lacks the most essential social services, such as hospitals and schools. Despite some progress, 68 percent of school-age Arab children do not have schools or teachers. As a result of the war, 140,000 Arabs live in sectors under Military Government Control, which means that they lack the most essential civil rights, have no elected municipal authorities, and suffer from other disabilities. Government declarations to the contrary, only an insignificant number of the Arab refugees was allowed to return to the country. It is an unfortunate fact that the Arabs suffer from racial discrimination. It was only because of the attitude of the left wing opposition that several essential improvements were made. MAPAM has had to carry on a continuous struggle against anti-Arab discrimination in everyday life, as well as against the hypocrisy of the government, which maintains that the Arabs enjoy the same rights as other Israeli citizens.

MAPAM took a definite and positive stand on the two main aspects of the Arab question in Israel. Thus, concerning the Arab refugees, the Central Committee of the Party stated in October, 1948:

As the return of peace approaches, it is the duty of the Israeli government to permit the return of all those Arab refugees who are able and willing to accept the authority of the government of Israel. Their reintegration should take place within the framework of the plan of development of the country.

This is in opposition to the government position which allows the entrance only of those who plan to rejoin close family relatives remaining in Israel.

On the issue of equal pay and equal opportunity for employment, a MAPAM resolution stated that both of these were basic elementary rights which should be insured to every citizen of Israel, irrespective of national origin, language, and sex.

While these resolutions are quite clear, the fact is that party members are divided in their opinions about the Arab question. The army men in particular hold the view that one cannot trust the Arabs too far and that one should "keep one's powder dry," just in case. They do not differentiate between the Arab feudal lords who, together with the British imperialists, incited the Arab masses to war,

and the victims of this campaign. One must note that during the war, when there were cases of mistreatment of Arabs, the attitude of these elements was not always the most commendable. On the other hand, there are elements in the party, among them M. A. Cohen, who try to make the party a bulwark in the defense of the interests of the Arab minority.

The main dissension over the Arab question in MAPAM centered around the issue of organization. The question was whether MAPAM should be an *Israeli territorial party* and, as such, open to both Jews and Arabs, or whether it should be a *Jewish Zionist party*. MAPAM has, it should be noted, a large number of local sections in most countries of the Diaspora. These sections act on Zionist lines, struggling towards the "Ingathering of Exiles," that is, emigration to Israel of the majority of the Jewish people. The members of the party who wanted MAPAM to remain a Jewish Zionist party asked whether the Arabs could be members in the World Zionist Organization, and proposed the organization of the Arabs in a special section, parallel to the party and having organic connections with the party's central organs. There were a great number of proposals such as full membership in the Histadruth and a special status within MAPAM and so on. As a matter of fact, however, there is only one truly socialist answer to this question: full membership for the Arabs in both the party and the Histadruth. Technical difficulties served as a pretext for the elements who held that the Arabs were not trustworthy, that Arab members could not participate in internal debates involving military questions, and who did not believe in the existence of the "forces of tomorrow" within the Arab camp. The latest MAPAM party congress adopted a compromise resolution, while stating explicitly that the matter remained open.

2. The Problems of Organization

This problem now claims the center of the party's attention and does undoubtedly require a prompt and radical solution. The reader has noticed that having presented some problem, we have often stated that a compromise solution was reached. The organizational structure of the party is such, however, that in many cases the party has to acknowledge the impossibility of action. The latest discussions accentuated the rift between the component parts of MAPAM (Hashomer Hatzair, Achduth Avodah, Left Poalei Zion). Today it is an indisputable fact that there exist separate organized factions within the party. Yet a revolutionary workers' party must have a unified organizational structure in order to wage its fight.

Opposing the policy of a strong central organization based on real democracy within the party, many leaders are in favor of the continuity of the present regime of "internal democracy" at the top, whose results are too often interminable discussions on the one hand, and lack of mass consultation and political impotency on the other. There are of course historical and economic reasons for this state of affairs, the chief ones being the heterogeneity of the constituent groups, and the fact that until recently a really class-conscious Israeli proletariat did not exist. But now, as the political tension and class-struggle in Israel heighten, a change in the organizational structure of MAPAM may result. Thus while at the top of the party there still exists a ratio of parity between the representatives of the right and left tendencies, the opposite is true for the rank and file of the party. Indeed, we estimate that 75 percent of the members are already inclined toward the left wing. The former Achduth Haavodah leaders are gradually losing their influence. Also, almost half of the party members are new immigrants who entered the country after 1947. Thus we see a radical change within the ranks of the former Left Poalei Zion, where the new immigration from the new democracies is opposed to the right wing policy of the Israeli leaders.

The next Congress of MAPAM, which will convene in the spring of 1951, will have to elect the new leaders of the party and also to clear, once and for all, the problem of the party structure. Many leaders, well aware of the temper of many party members, are striving courageously towards a radical change. We shall mention only what J. Rifkin, secretary of MAPAM, has to propose on this question:

- a. Our party must be, more than it is today, a Marxist party. Marxism-Leninism must be more than a paragraph in the party platform, it must be the basis of all our activities.
- b. Our party must grow more and more united, until it becomes a bloc, without any differences caused by the previous party allegiances. Only such a party can victoriously fight our numerous and all-surrounding enemies.
- c. Our party must learn to organize itself not only around the slogan of unity, but in a truly democratic way—implying that the minority loyally abides by the decisions of the majority. Full discipline must be observed, both below and above.
- d. Our party must be the home of all Arab workers, as it is the home of all Jewish workers, for internationalism abroad is only an empty word if it is not at first realized nearer home.

In dealing with the organizational problem of the party we would like also to touch upon the crucial question: what is the mission and future of a Marxist non-Communist party? Parties such as the Italian Socialist Party or the MAPAM in Israel appeared and grew out of a definite historical situation. They had, and they still have, a most important historic mission to fulfill. But it would be wrong to underline and accentuate the differences between ourselves and the Communist parties so as to be able to say: "We are not Communists. We are independent." The organizational structure of the Communist parties today is the most suitable for the purpose of the class struggle. We must adopt the structure of a workers' party in the spirit of the principles proposed by the masters of Marxism—Lenin and Stalin. MAPAM can develop itself in the future only insofar as it collaborates loyally with all progressive elements in the country and on the international level; only insofar as it tends towards socialism and prepares the workers for a common socialist-Communist struggle against capitalism.

We have mentioned earlier the MAPAM-Communist controversy on Zionism. But this difficulty must in no way prevent the closest cooperation between MAPAM and the socialist camp. It is our deep conviction that the existence of a strong MAPAM working on the basis of close unity with Communists, other socialists, and all progressives in the country, will in time result in a change of attitude toward the Zionist question on the part of the Communist parties.

Whether or not MAPAM will be strong enough to fulfill its role in the State of Israel and in the Jewish world depends to a large degree on its own internal development. MAPAM today faces the following choice: either it will rise to the necessity of the hour and become the major party of the Israeli working class, or it will sink in the morass of social democracy, i.e. fiery speeches, grandiloquent proclamations, but little activity. If it bases its work on the militant struggles of the working class, MAPAM will fulfill its historical mission.

Let us not forget that MAPAM has done and still does a lot. If the status of the Arabs in Israel is better than that of the black people in South Africa, it is because of the fight of Israel's workers' parties—MAPAM and the Communist Party. On the main issue of the day—the fight for peace—MAPAM has never relaxed. The party is well aware of the crucial role of the Soviet Union in the fight for peace, and it has always been the strongest supporter in Israel for Israel-Soviet friendship.

THE CURRENT ECONOMIC SITUATION

The following analysis is reprinted, by permission, from the *UE Washington Notes* of January 1951. It summarizes the economic analysis of the present situation presented to a recent UE General Executive Board meeting by Russ Nixon, former Harvard economist and now Washington representative of the UE. Preparing clear, up-to-date, straightforward analyses of the current scene has long been a job that the UE has recognized as vital to the proper performance of its trade-union functions. In this respect, the rest of the American labor movement could well take a leaf from the UE book.—The Editors.

The Federal Budget

The economic outlook for an indefinite time to come will be dominated by the federal budget. For 1951, the best available estimate is that the federal government will spend about \$75 billion, of which \$55 billion will be for the armed forces, atomic bomb production, and foreign military aid. Even this gigantic military expenditure will probably be further increased.

This federal budget of \$75 billion will consume about 30 percent of national income, and will require a substantial shift of overall production from civilian to military use. There isn't the same slack in the economy which existed in 1940 and 1941. Instead of adding "guns to butter," as was done then, the plan now is to substitute "guns" for a lot of the "butter." This means substantial cuts in living standards, especially for those with lower incomes.

The cut in living standards will be applied chiefly through higher taxes, rising prices, wage freezing, and elimination of government's social services. It will be accompanied by longer working hours and pressure for even greater speed-up.

Taxes

Congress and the Administration are taking direct action to reduce workers' living standards to the level required by the huge military budget. A very direct way to reduce workers' living standards is through higher taxes. Thus President Truman and Treasury Secretary Snyder have announced that more and much heavier taxes will be imposed in 1951.

The average worker already carries a much greater tax burden than he may realize. For an average family, earning from \$3,000 to \$3,200, the total of direct and indirect taxes, federal, state, and

local, comes to between \$600 and \$700. Of the total, direct income and social-security taxes so far do not exceed \$200 on the average. The rest is paid in retail taxes and taxes which are passed on in the price of the things you buy.

The 20 percent increase in withholding taxes, effective October 1, 1950, seemed like a big increase. Actually, it raises only about \$2.7 billion altogether. It was only a small taste of what's to come, with at least \$20 billion more to be raised in new taxes.

The bulk of the tax burden is carried by low incomes. In 1939, for example, incomes under \$3,000 paid less than 5 percent of federal income taxes. Now families with that same real income pay 50 percent of all federal income taxes. The share of the total tax load borne by low incomes apparently is going to increase.

Taxation is always a choice of alternatives—who should pay the tax. The rich have always managed to dodge their fair share of taxes by hiring clever lawyers and lobbying legislators. J. P. Morgan once said a man was a fool to pay taxes he could dodge. But the best friend of the rich, year in and year out, is Congress. Congress invariably leans to the alternative of raising more taxes from the poor, and granting wider loopholes to the rich.

For example, in 1948 Congress voted to allow wealthy couples to split their income. Each half of the split income is then taxed at a lower rate. Because of this, incomes above \$10,000 will generally pay lower taxes in 1951 than in 1939 or during World War II. The income-splitting provision will cost the Treasury roughly \$1 billion in 1951.

Another example of Congress' partiality to the rich is the corporation tax. In 1950, when corporations took in nearly \$40 billion before taxes, Congress raised corporate taxes by less than \$5 billion per year—\$1.5 billion in the 1950 Revenue Act, and \$3.2 billion in the 1950 Excess Profits Tax. At the same time, it gave corporations an opportunity to save well over \$1 billion per year by deducting from their taxes the cost of much new plant and equipment. The *Wall Street Journal* of December 18, 1950, called it "a special brand of tax relief" that "can soften the shock of any new excess profits tax on many companies." The government has already, as a part of the defense mobilization, granted new authorizations to companies to deduct \$1 billion of new plant expenditures in this manner over the next five years.

Congress continues to do nothing about dozens of other tax loopholes used by corporations and wealthy individuals, which cost the Treasury an estimated \$5 billion per year or more. What the Treasury fails to get from the rich, it makes sure of getting from the poor who cannot dodge one penny of their taxes.

THE CURRENT ECONOMIC SITUATION

Thus, the Chamber of Commerce has just proposed that 72 percent of all new taxes come from incomes under \$2,000. The First National Bank of Boston has proclaimed that "the bulk of the increase in taxes must come from those in the lower income groups."

To squeeze more taxes out of low incomes, it is proposed not only to raise withholding taxes on workers' incomes, but to add higher excise taxes, new kinds of concealed taxes on consumption, and a federal retail sales tax. All the Big Business pressure groups are lobbying for some sort of sales tax.

This campaign to raise taxes to pay-as-you-go for a \$75 billion federal budget will have a clear result: *the direct and indirect taxes paid by the average worker and his family will rise to around \$1,000 per year!*

Prices

Another way of cutting living standards is to allow prices to rise. To this end, Congress on September 1, 1950, passed a weak price control law. . . . Raw materials prices rose 29 percent between June and November 1950, foreshadowing general price rises all along the line. The Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index is at an all-time high and has been rising in recent months at a rate of 12 percent per year. With frozen wages, this is the same as a 12 percent wage cut.

Rents

The biggest *single* item in the cost of living—rent—is subject to only weak, partial, and temporary controls until March 31, 1951.

Rent controls have already been removed from 6 million rental units, over one-third of those once under OPA. Where units have already been decontrolled, rents have risen as much as 100 percent or more. Vacancy rates in large cities are practically zero. New rental units suitable for families with children rent for \$85 a month and up. The Housing Expeditor reported last year that "there is no relief in sight for the millions of families who so desperately need housing." (Testimony to Senate Banking and Currency Committee, April 24, 1950.)

The public housing program authorized by the 1949 Housing Act has broken down completely. This act authorized construction of 135,000 low-cost units per year. Since July, 1949, only 11,000 units have been started!

The so-called "cost of living" index of the BLS utterly fails to reflect the cost of housing to the American people. For example, when

MONTHLY REVIEW

Census figures indicated that average city rents throughout the country had risen nearly 30 percent from April, 1940, to April, 1947. the BLS rent index showed a rise of only 4 percent!

Wages

Rising prices have wiped out every round of wage increases since World War II. Money wages averaged \$62 per week in manufacturing in November 1950, for a work week of 41.1 hours. But these weekly wages had \$4 per week less buying power than wages at the World War II peak in 1945.

The terms of the Defense Production Act of 1950 indicate that workers' living standards will be cut further in 1951 and thereafter by the direct method of freezing wages while the cost of living is allowed to rise.

Such a wage-control policy means that controls will be applied to wages which are already, on the average, substantially below health and decency standards. In 1949, for example, annual earnings of all wage and salary workers averaged \$2,730. The cost of the BLS City Workers' Family Budget in 1949 is estimated to have been around \$3,450—or \$720 more than the average worker received.

In manufacturing, the average was better: \$3,100 in wages, but still \$350 per year below the Budget's cost in 1949. Today the Budget costs substantially more.

Unemployment—Longer Hours—Speed-up

Workers' living standards will be cut in 1951 in still another way: cutbacks in supplies of metals, rubber, and other basic materials for civilian production will mean several weeks of unemployment for millions of workers. This will seriously reduce the *annual* income of such workers.

Even in the face of wide-spread layoffs, employers and government agencies are already pressing for a longer work-week and more speed-up. Industrial and financial leaders and powerful forces in Congress are already demanding a 48-hour week with no overtime pay and elimination of premium pay for work on holidays and Saturday and Sunday as such.

Profits

In contrast to the wage, price, and tax outlook for the average worker, profits are at the highest levels on record. The estimated rate in the third quarter of 1950 was \$42 billion per year, before taxes, and \$24.4 billion per year, after taxes.

Manufacturing profits after taxes are currently about 17 percent

THE CURRENT ECONOMIC SITUATION

of investment. At the peak of Hoover prosperity, the rate was only 8.6 percent.

General Electric is currently earning 23 percent on its stockholders' investment; Westinghouse, 20 percent; General Motors, around 40 percent.

Manufacturing corporations are paying themselves about 53 cents in profits for every dollar they pay out in wages and salaries.

Their profit take amounts to \$1,700 per worker.

THE NEW COLOSSUS

(Inscription on the Statue of Liberty)

*Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed, to me:
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.*

—Emma Lazarus

THE NEW COLOSSUS—BROUGHT UP TO DATE

(Written after reading the headline "Exiles from Soviet Bloc Proclaim Principles for a Liberated Europe.")

*Give me your angry, your rich,
Your privileged classes yearning to trade free,
The would-be destroyers of your socialistic shore,
Send these, the counter-revolutionaries, hate-filled, to me:
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.*

—Anon

Here, a white scoundrel, because he is white, is preferred to an honest and educated black man. . . . Nowhere in the world are the worth and dignity of manhood more exalted in speech and press than they are here, and nowhere is manhood pure and simple more despised than here.

—Frederick Douglass

WHAT MAKES REVOLUTIONS

BY JAMES ALDRIDGE

You are claiming that the Soviet authorities began and influenced the existence of the Democratic Party. That is the basis of all your statements. The simplest way to discredit your absurd claim is to tell you about Iran, of which you are apparently ignorant. The people of Iran are oppressed, poverty-stricken, and miserable with hunger and disease. Their death rate is among the highest in the world, and their infant mortality rate threatens Iran with complete extinction. They are ruled without choice by feudalistic landowners, ruthless Khans, and venal industrialists. The peasants are slaves and the workers are paid a few pennies for a twelve-hour day—not enough to keep their families in food. I can quote you all the figures you like to support these statements, quote them if necessary from British sources. I can also quote you the figures of the wealth which is taken out of Iran yearly by the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, of which the British Government is the largest shareholder. Two hundred and forty million pounds a year is taken out of Iran by your oil company: a hundred times the total amount of Iran's national income and ten thousand times the total national income of the working people of Iran. By such natural resources as oil, Iran is by nature one of the wealthiest countries on earth. That wealth goes to Britain, while Iran remains poverty ridden and without economic stability at all. It has no wage policies, no real trade unions, few hospitals, no sanitation and drainage, no irrigation, no proper housing, and no adequate road system. Its people have no rights before the law; their franchise is nonexistent; and their parliamentary rights are destroyed by the corrupt methods of election and political choice. The Iranian people suffer the terrors of a police regime, and they are prey to the manipulations of the grain speculators and the money operators. The racial minorities suffer discrimination and intolerance, and religious minorities are persecuted for political ends. Banditry threatens the mountain districts, and British arms have been used to support one tribe against another.

I could go on indefinitely, painting you a picture of misery and starvation and imprisonment and subjection which must shame

In this excerpt from James Aldridge's novel, The Diplomat, Suchkov, a Russian, explains to Lord Essex, English diplomat, the origin of the people's revolt against colonial exploitation. Reprinted here by permission of the publisher, Little, Brown & Company.

WHAT MAKES REVOLUTIONS

any human being capable of hearing it. Yet you say that the existence of a Democratic Party in Iran has been created by the Soviet authorities. You underestimate the Iranian people, Lord Essex! The Democratic Party has arisen out of all this misery and subjection as a force against corruption and oppression. Until now the Iranian people have been unable to create a political party because the police system prevented it by terror and assassination. Any attempt to organize the workers and peasants was quickly halted by the execution of party leaders and the vast imprisonment of its followers. The Iranian people, however, have a long record of struggle and persistence, and they do not have to be told by the Soviet Union where their interests lie. They are not stupid and they are not utterly destroyed. They still possess the will to organize a democratic body and follow it into paths of government. The Soviet Union has simply made sure that the police assassins did not interfere, particularly in the case of Azerbaijan. To talk of our part in "creating" the Democratic movement is an insult to the people and a sign of ignorance. We do not underestimate the Iranian people, and as far as we are concerned the Democratic Party of Azerbaijan belongs to the people. It is their creation and their right, and it cannot be broken by wild charges which accuse the Soviet Union of its birth. We did not create it, and we have not interfered in the affairs of Iran. On the contrary, it is the British Government which has interfered continuously and viciously in Iran's affairs.

We Marxists believe that a revolution will also take place in other countries. But it will take place only when the revolutionaries in those countries think it possible, or necessary. The export of revolution is nonsense. Every country will make its own revolution if it wants to and if it does not want to there will be no revolution. For example, our country wanted to make a revolution and made it, and now we are building a new classless society. But to assert that we want to make a revolution in other countries, to interfere in their lives, means saying what is untrue, and what we have never advocated.

—Stalin, in an interview with Roy Howard, 1936

It is privilege that causes evil in the world, not wickedness, and not men.

—Lincoln Steffens

"FREE WORLD" DEPARTMENT

Under this heading we will present from time to time illuminating pieces of source material about the nature and workings of the "Free World" in defense of which the American ruling class is leading a holy crusade.—The Editors

This armored column today took a little hamlet north of Anyang that will go down as a macabre tribute to the totality of push-button war. A napalm raid hit the village three or four days ago when the Chinese were holding up the advance, and nowhere in the village have they buried the dead because there is nobody left to do so.

This correspondent came across one old woman, the only one who seemed to be left alive, dazedly hanging up some clothes in a blackened courtyard filled with the bodies of four members of her family. The inhabitants throughout the village and in the fields were caught and killed and kept the exact postures they had held when the napalm struck—a man about to get on his bicycle, fifty boys and girls playing in an orphanage, a housewife strangely unmarked, holding in her hand a page torn from a Sears-Roebuck catalogue crayed at mail order number 3,811,294 for a \$2.98 "bewitching bed jacket—coral." There must be almost 200 dead in the tiny hamlet.

—New York Times, Feb. 9, 1951

GIs OBLITERATE VILLAGE IN REPRISAL FOR AMBUSH

With the U.S. Second Division in North Korea, Nov. 9 (Delayed)—In reprisal for the deaths of five GIs whose advance patrol had been ambushed, U.S. tanks, planes and artillery today obliterated the village of Tuom-ni.

The command was to level the village and leave no trace. The command was executed to the letter, at noon sharp. What once was Tuom-ni no longer exists. There is not even any rubble. There is only the silence of death, and the scars which earth shows after concentrated bombardment.

The ambushed patrol—16 men—had been part of the 38th Infantry Regiment. They were sent forward on Nov. 7. When nothing was heard from them, an armored rescue mission was sent out.

"FREE WORLD" DEPARTMENT

I was allowed to accompany the rescue group. We made our way under heavy fire close to the town. There, on a hillside, we found the ambushed 16. Five were dead, the rest wounded. They had been stripped of their clothing.

We managed to get the men back to our own lines, where they said the ambush had been carried out with the help of Tuom-ni civilians.

It was decided that a village whose civilians help ambush American troops is a village to be razed.

Therefore, at noon, the bombardment started, and not much later, there was no more Tuom-ni.

—N. Harry Smith in *The Compass*, Nov. 22, 1950

BRITISH EFFACE MALAYAN TOWN SUSPECTED OF AIDING RED REBELS

A town of 1,500 population has disappeared from the map of Malaya within the last twenty-four hours. The place was Jenderam, in Selangor State, a quiet little town that for a long time has been suspected of giving aid and comfort to Communist guerrillas in the near-by jungle. Troops and police moved in suddenly at daybreak with trucks, buses and ambulances. The entire population were carried away to detention camps, where they will be screened before being resettled in a new location 100 miles away.

As an organized community, Jenderam is finished. What the Chinese, Malayan and Indian villagers could not carry away—their livestock and immovable chattels—will be auctioned off. What remains will be destroyed. Never again will Jenderam be available to the Communists as a source of food, supply and man power.

Jenderam is the biggest settlement so far eliminated in a campaign to resettle 300,000 people in Malaya. Most of them are squatters living on the fringes of the vast Malayan jungle. These squatters are nominally law-abiding citizens, but the British rulers of Malaya have plenty of evidence to show that Communist intimidation and persuasion has made them the dupes of Communist terror. So, after more than two years of unsuccessful effort to suppress the Communist insurrection in Malaya, the British have been forced to adopt methods which to some outsiders may seem ruthless, but which the British now regard as unavoidable.

—A. T. Steele in *New York Herald Tribune*, Feb. 17, 1951

SCANDAL IN AUSTRIA BARED

People's Party Got Funds From Illegal Owner of Paper Mill

(Special to THE NEW YORK TIMES)

VIENNA, Dec. 22—The Austrian Administrative Court decided yesterday that the Guggenberger Paper Mills, which were "Aryanized" in 1938, should be returned to the Ruhmann family, their original owners, who fled to the United States when the Nazis entered Austria. The hearing of the case uncovered a political scandal unique even in Austria, which has had many of late.

Evidence was given that after Austria's liberation the Nazi Aryanizer of the paper business was dispossessed and imprisoned, but that the plant was not returned to its original owners, as has been the usual custom. Instead, it was leased to a newly founded paper company for \$10,000 yearly, although its profits in 1947 totaled \$42,000. In return the company promised to pay \$23,000 to the campaign chest of the People's party, senior party in the Austrian Government coalition, and twice that much should the new company obtain final ownership of the plant.

—New York Times, Dec. 23, 1950.

WEEP, HIPPOCRATES!

In North Carolina Hippocrates' surgical gown is much like a Klansman's hood.

Maltheus R. Avery, 24-year-old college student, was critically injured near Mebane, N. C., in an auto accident Dec. 1. According to the Afro-America of Dec. 16, he was taken to Alamance General Hospital. There it was learned he had sustained fractures of the skull, cheekbone, jawbone, leg and arm.

But Maltheus Avery was a Negro. The redness of his life's blood was secondary to the color of his skin. So Alamance shunted him on to Duke University Hospital in Durham.

Here, at this great Southern Methodist medical center, he spent 10 minutes in the emergency room. The seriousness of his condition was confirmed. But the Negro ward was full. It would not do at all to treat him on the same sheets whites would have to use later—however well laundered.

So the eminent doctors of Duke deliberated duly and reached the proper decision. They sent him on to Lincoln Hospital, a Negro

"FREE WORLD" DEPARTMENT

institution. And there, within an hour after his arrival, Avery died! . . . died in the way thought proper by the people at Alamance, died in the manner designated by the sages at Duke.

Among his survivors are two brothers in the United States Army, Recruit Waddell Avery, Fort Jackson, S.C., and Reserve Officer Cadet Parnell Avery, Virginia State College.

—The Southern Patriot, January, 1951

I think your publication is magnificent and will continue to do everything I possibly can to insure its survival and successful expansion. I'm only sorry that I won't find it regularly in the prison library, which is, unfortunately the only place I'm going to find anything readable for sometime to come. The draft has unfortunately become a very strong wind for me, and since I have declined to wear khaki, I must settle for stripes.

—Letter to the editors of MR from a subscriber

They are trying to send us to prison for speaking our minds. Very well, let them. I tell you that if it had not been for men and women who in the past have had the moral courage to go to prison, we would still be in the jungles.

—Eugene V. Debs

Disobedience, in the eyes of any one who has read history, is man's original virtue. It is through disobedience that progress has been made, through disobedience and through rebellion.

—Oscar Wilde, *The Soul of Man Under Socialism*

FOR THE RECORD

A book entitled *Russia's Soviet Economy* by the anti-Soviet expert of the *New York Times*, Harry Schwartz, was recently published by the firm of Prentice-Hall. In the preface, one of the editors of MR (Paul Sweezy) is named as among those who were of assistance to the author. A number of MR readers have written to express surprise, regret, or disapproval. We share these sentiments. Hence for the record we print the following exchange of letters.—The Editors.

From Paul M. Sweezy to Prentice-Hall, January 23, 1951

It has been brought to my attention that in the preface of *Russia's Soviet Economy* by Harry Schwartz, recently published by you, the following passage appears:

Keenly conscious of his own deficiencies, the writer has sought the advice and counsel of other specialists with great profit to himself and to this work. Among those who have read portions of this work and who have made valuable suggestions are . . . Paul Sweezy. . . .

The facts of the matter are that Mr. Schwartz at no time sought my advice and counsel and that he did not have permission to use my name in any way. One of your editors wrote me some months ago asking me if I would read a chapter of a book on the Soviet economy and offering me an honorarium of \$15 for my opinion. He did not mention the name of the author, presumably because he wanted a judgment uninfluenced by the identity of the author. I read the chapter in question and wrote a short opinion, mostly adverse, of its quality. In sending me your check for \$15, your editor disclosed that the book from which the chapter had been taken was written by Harry Schwartz.

I need hardly point out that under these circumstances the implication which is certain to be drawn by readers from Mr. Schwartz's remark in the preface, quoted above, is highly misleading. My relation to the book was purely in the capacity of publisher's reader, and I did not even know who the author was until after that relation had terminated. I was not asked for permission to use my name in connection with the book, and if I had been asked I would have refused such permission.

In view of these facts, I request that you delete my name from the preface of all copies of the book sold from now on. I would

FOR THE RECORD

appreciate hearing by return mail that you have received this letter and intend to comply with this request.

From Wilbur F. Eastman, Jr., Associate Editor of Prentice-Hall, to Paul M. Sweezy, January 30, 1951

This will acknowledge your letter of January 23. We are extremely sorry that some misunderstanding seems to have occurred. We are taking the matter up with the author immediately, and we will get in touch with you again very shortly.

From Howard Warrington, Vice President of Prentice-Hall, to Paul M. Sweezy, February 6, 1951

This is in further reference to your letter of January 23rd.

We have talked with the author, Professor Schwartz, and he shares our surprise at the position you have taken. As he points out, there is no misrepresentation whatever involved, and it has long been considered routine academic courtesy to make acknowledgments of the kind you have called into question.

However, since you feel the way you do about it, we will plan to delete your name from the preface. This will take effect in our second printing, which will go to press shortly.

I am sincerely sorry that we have been at cross-purposes here and that the author's customary gesture of good will has produced this opposite, and most unexpected, reaction.

From Paul M. Sweezy to Howard Warrington, February 9, 1951

I am glad to have your letter of February 6th and to know that you plan to delete my name from the preface to Harry Schwartz's book, *Russia's Soviet Economy*.

For the sake of the record, I should like to say that I do not see how the misrepresentation could be clearer: Mr. Schwartz implies that he sought my advice and counsel, whereas in reality my only connection with his book was through the publisher and without my knowing the identity of the author.

I intend to publish our exchange of letters so that others may judge for themselves whether or not this is a case of "routine academic courtesy."

MONTHLY REVIEW

(continued from inside front cover)

At the same time, we want to assure our readers that we shall not publish anything unless we know who the author is and have convincing reasons to believe that he or she is competent, serious, and worth listening to.

One final word. Of course, we would rather publish articles under the authors' names. It is better that there should be a direct relationship between writer and reader. Moreover, we think that every one who is in a position to say openly what he has to say can set a good example and bring courage to others. We therefore urge authors who can do so without jeopardizing their livelihood, or impairing their usefulness to the cause of progress, to speak out. When that is not possible, however, we will understand—and we hope our readers will, too.

Scott Nearing, who writes the excellent quarterly *World Events* (125 Fifth St., N.E., Washington 2, D. C.—\$1 a year), and Fred Blossom and the group who print and distribute it, have been our fast friends ever since the inception of MR. If they had the true capitalist spirit, they would look upon us as competitors in the radical-literature market. Instead, being endowed with the true spirit of socialism which moves them to put the cause first, they have helped us in every way possible. They have given us free advertising, circularized their readership with recommendations to subscribe to MR, and even helped to raise the money needed to reprint "Sound the Alarm" in pamphlet form. We take this occasion to express our deepest gratitude to all of them.

Speaking of "Sound the Alarm" reminds us to report other pamphlet news. So many requests have come in for Professor Einstein's "Why Socialism?" that we finally decided to reprint it once again. By the time this reaches you, that now-famous article will again be available. You will find prices listed on the back cover; please order promptly.

We have been generally reluctant to reprint material from MR in pamphlet form, not because we are in any way opposed to the principle, but because of the burden it puts on our already-overloaded facilities (both staff and storage space). Nevertheless, we finally yielded to repeated urgings to make the two articles on the UN from the December and January issues into a pamphlet. The final argument was that several friends pitched in and raised part of the money to pay the costs. In this case, the desirability of making this material available to the widest possible public was all too clearly demonstrated by the way the UN gave in to United States insistence on branding China as an aggressor. This action was taken in the face of opposition from every important country in the world and provides melancholy confirmation of the correctness of the thesis of the December article. The UN pamphlet is now ready: full details on the back cover.

Many MR readers have long been convinced socialists—not a few, indeed, were preaching the gospel before the editors knew how to spell the word. We are glad that they find MR worthy of their support, but we admit frankly that we write and edit the magazine less with their requirements in mind than with a view to reaching the *unconvinced*. You will understand, therefore, why we are specially pleased when we get a letter like this:

Last night for the first time I saw a copy of your publication and was amazed to find that there is a writer who can write about

(continued on inside back cover)

(continued from page 510)

"leftist" matters in a calm, judicial, and seemingly impartial manner. I am myself a native-born American who loves his country beyond every other consideration. I am a Republican and instinctively fearful of anything that smacks of communism or socialism. But somehow your September MR shows me that there is a possibility of discussing "liberal" views without insulting the intelligence of the readers. Strangely, I found myself reading articles masterfully written in which were expressed the same thoughts I have myself frequently expressed lately in my amateurish way—but they never occurred to me as being shared by any person or any publication confessing to being "socialist."

I wonder if many of us don't vehemently condemn things by names instead of principles and often thereby shut ourselves out from acquiring knowledge which might give us much consolation?

I hope my subscription to your skillfully edited paper does not make me a "subversive"—but in my America, at least prior to the last decade, we were taught to want information on both and all sides of questions and not to have our opinions formed for us by powerful, conscienceless propaganda fitted to the exigencies of a current political situation!

The jam in the postoffice due to the railroad strike did more than merely delay the mailing of our February issue—it seems to have prevented some copies from ever reaching their destination. If your February magazine hasn't arrived, please notify us and we will mail you another.

We have the agreeable feeling that MR is catching on—a feeling based on solid fact. In just three months (November, December, and January) new subs totalled well over 600, considerably more than the number we had when we printed Vol. 1, No. 1.

MR Associates, announced last month, is off to a good start. Two weeks after the first circular was sent out to the whole subscription list, more than 175 readers had joined, and the number is still growing. That is much better than the originators of the project expected.

A subscriber from St. Louis describes his technique for getting new subscribers: he gives a sub to a friend on condition that if the friend likes the magazine he will do the same for a friend of his, and so on. A good idea, it seems to us.

As we approach the end of Vol. II, we come to the period when a large proportion of subs expire. Please read the enclosed leaflet carefully, and if your sub is about to expire, and if you have not already done so, please renew at once—either in the regular way or by joining MR Associates (membership includes automatic renewal).

Subscription Book Offers For Renewals Or New Subscriptions

- ☐ \$3 for a one-year subscription
 - ☐ \$4 for a one-year sub and *The Truth About Socialism*
 - ☐ \$5 for a two-year subscription
- (For address outside U.S.: add 50c for 1-year sub, \$1 for 2-year sub)
- ☐ Renewal ☐ New Subscription

Name Street.....

City Zone State

Monthly Review — 66 Barrow Street — New York 14, N. Y.

MONTHLY REVIEW PAMPHLETS

1. WHY SOCIALISM? by Professor Albert Einstein

Another printing of the warm human declaration for socialism by the world's most famous scientist. Reprinted from Vol. I, No. 1. 8 pages.

10c per copy

12 for \$1

100 for \$5

2. INSIDE THE UNITED NATIONS by A Special Correspondent

This article, by a close observer of the United Nations since its inception, has created a sensation both here and abroad. It is combined in a 32-page pamphlet with the second UN article **The American Struggle Against Human Rights** by the same author.

Reprinted from Vol. 2, Nos. 8 and 9. 32 pages.

25c per copy

6 for \$1

40 for \$5

3. SOUND THE ALARM by the Editors

This follow-up of the famous MR article **Korea** analyzes our foreign policy and warns Americans against its consequences.

Reprinted from Vol. 2, No. 5. 16 pages.

(Second printing almost exhausted. Order promptly.)

10c per copy

20 for \$1

125 for \$5

All prices include postage. Address your orders to
MONTHLY REVIEW, 66 Barrow Street, New York 14, N. Y.

BACK ISSUES OF MONTHLY REVIEW

are still available at the regular price of 35c per copy, except for Vol I, No. 1 (containing the Einstein article) which has become a collector's item and is now priced at \$1 per copy; also priced at \$1 is Vol. II, No. 6, the Matthiessen Memorial Issue, dedicated to the late Professor F. O. Matthiessen of Harvard, whose initial support made possible the founding of MR. That issue, entitled **F. O. MATTHIESSEN, A COLLECTIVE PORTRAIT**, has been published as a book by Henry Schuman, Inc. The book sells for \$2.50.

New subscribers may obtain a complete file of MR by dating their subscription back to Vol. I, No. 1. This will enable them to secure all the back issues of Volume I and Volume II for the special price of \$3.75 each volume, or \$7.50 for the two.

